# Econ down the drain

## Uniqueness

#### Trump wants to cut SNAP and SS funding- but GOP and Supporters are holding him back

**Brownstein** **17’** Brownstein, Ronald. “Trump's Cuts to SNAP and Social Security Would Hit the Rust Belt Hard.” The Atlantic, Atlantic Media Company, 23 May 2017, [www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/05/trump-budget-snap-social-security/527799/](http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/05/trump-budget-snap-social-security/527799/).

In the key Rustbelt states that tipped the 2016 election to President **Trump**, blue-collar white voters at the core of his constituency represent a majority of those receiving benefits from the federal income-support programs he **has targeted** for **large cutbacks in his budget**, according a new analysis conducted for *The Atlantic*. **Whites** without a four-year college degree **constitute most** of those **receiving** assistance **from** the **S**upplemental **N**utrition **A**ssistance **P**rogram, Social Security’s Supplemental Security Income program, **and Social Security**’s disability program **in** each of the five Rustbelt **states that flipped** from Barack Obama in 2012 to **Trump in 2016**: Iowa, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. **They** also represent a majority of the programs’ beneficiaries in other heavily working-class interior states—from Arkansas and Kentucky through Missouri and Montana—that **are central to GOP fortunes in upcoming elections**. Trump’s budget, released Tuesday morning, looks to protect the older whites vital to his electoral coalition by exempting both Medicare and the principal Social Security retirement program from any cuts: About 80 percent of today’s seniors are white, and Trump carried about three-fifths of white seniors in last fall’s election. In stark contrast, **the budget focuses large reductions on domestic discretionary-spending programs that invest in the productivity of future generations**, including scientific research, education, student loans, and the Children’s Health Insurance Program. In those ways, the budget displays a clear preference for the predominantly white senior population over the rapidly diversifying youth population: As I’ve written, it [strongly favors](https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/02/trumps-budget-proposal-threatens-democratic-and-republican-ambitions/518061/)the “gray” over the “brown.” But **because Trump extends** his budget **cuts** so deeply and broadly **through income-support programs**, the **reductions** still inevitably **reach many of the lower-income and less-educated whites** that have emerged as the cornerstone of the modern Republican coalition. The large number of GOP-leaning voters who rely on programs Trump would retrench underscores the difficulty his party faces in reconciling their ideological drive to shrink government spending with the material needs of their increasingly working-class and older white supporters. Not only did Trump depend on big margins among older and non-college-educated whites, but [about three-fifths of House Republicans](https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/01/house-republicans-racial-education-level/514733/)also represent districts older than the national average. And about three-fourths hold seats where more whites than the national average lack a college degree[.](https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/01/house-republicans-racial-education-level/514733/)

## Link

#### Increase in spending will cause a trade off in new programs

Khimm 11’ Suzy, Kimm Mother Jones, 2011 Suzy, Washington Bureau of Mother Jones, “How Not to Cut the Deficit” January 6, 2011, <http://motherjones.com/politics/2011/01/cutgo-deficit-boehner>)

**Under** the Democrats' "**p**ay-**a**s-**y**ou-**go**" rules—introduced during the Clinton era and continued under President Obama—**Congress had to match every spending increase or tax cut with a commensurate spending cut or tax increase. The GOP has** now **upended "pay-go" with "cut-go" rules, under which tax cuts don't have to be paid for and tax increases can't offset spending hikes**. "The idea is that the only two things you can do are cut spending and cut taxes," explains the Washington Post's Ezra Klein. The problem is that cutting taxes without paying for them gives the government less to work with when it comes to balancing the budget and reducing the deficit. Effectively, the **GOP rules** could **make it** even **more difficult to create new government programs**, while making it far easier for the GOP to hand tax breaks to corporations and the wealth

#### The plan spends billions – added personnel would be expensive—it'd force compromise on the budget to free up space for equipping and training service members.

**Becker et al** **07’** Becker, Gary, and Richard Posner. “Universal National Service--Posner.” The Becker-Posner Blog, Gary Becker and Richard Posner, 23 Sept. 2007, www.becker-posner-blog.com/2007/09/universal-national-service--posner.html.

There are perennial calls for drafting all 18 year olds to serve in either the military or some civilian alternative. Congressman Charles Rangel has repeatedly introduced bills in Congress (the "Universal National Service Act") that would do this. The bills have never come close to passage, and are unlikely to in the future even with Democratic control of both houses of Congress. But universal national service is one of those seductive ideas that refuse to die completely, and perhaps therefore it deserves a serious analysis. It is analytically interesting and can serve as an example of the utility of a cost-benefit approach to public programs. Roughly 4 million Americans reach the age of 18 every year. There are only 1.4 million active-duty military personnel, so only a small fraction of each vintage of 18 year olds could be assigned to the military. At their present size, our active-duty armed forces require only about 150,000 new recruits each year. So any **universal national service** obligation **would** have to be **primarily an obligation to do civilian work.** Civilian national service (in the United States--thus excluding the Peace Corps, and the missionary work that young Mormon men are required to perform for two years without compensation) funded by the federal government exists already. The "AmeriCorps" program provides federal grants to a large number of service organizations, both public and private. Although these **organizations pay** only the living expenses of their volunteers plus a modest education grant, the federal **contribution amounts to some $27,000 per volunteer.** The **number of volunteers supported by AmeriCorps** grants **is** small--well **under 100,000.** But of course total volunteer activity is much greater than that, and by no means limited to young persons--an affiliate of AmeriCorps is the "Senior Corps." A survey by the U.S. Department of Labor found that there were some 60 million American engaged in volunteer activities in 2006 and that the median number of hours that the volunteers devoted to such activities was about 50 hours a year. Thus, assuming that the average is not much different from the median and that a full-time job is 2000 hours a year, there were the equivalent of 1.5 million full-time volunteers (50/2000 x 60 million). That number is important because a universal national service obligation would have a substitution effect: someone required by law to provide a year of national service would be likely to reduce the amount of volunteer service that he would provide in the future. If, for example, there were a two-thirds reduction in volunteering, from 1.5 million full-tine equivalents to 500,000, and thus a loss of 1 million full-time-equivalent volunteers, universal national service would augment volunteer activities by only 3 million full-time equivalents a year (4 million - 3 million). Granted, **this number would rise if universal national service** had a complementary effect on volunteer service rather than or, more plausibly, as well as a substitution effect--if, that **is**, the year of obligatory service **created** a taste for such service. I find this implausible. If 4 million persons were conscripted for one year's national service, at an annual expense of $27,000 per person, **the program would cost more than $100 billion a year**--probably much more, because the $27,000 figure excludes the overhead expenses of the service organizations that receive the per capita grants. The $100 billion (or whatever the correct figure is) would be a transfer payment, but it would generate costs of two types. The first would be the deadweight costs that the taxes required to fund the payment would impose. The second and doubtless greater cost would be the difference between the value of the conscripts' national service work and the value of their output in whatever jobs they would have had were it not for their national service obligations. About half the 18 year olds would (but for their national service obligation) be in college rather than working, **and** so **the effect of universal national service** on them **would** be to **postpone their entry into the job market** by a year. Their lost wages in their first job would be a rough estimate of the value of their work in that job. The starting salary for college graduates is more than $40,000, other than for liberal-arts majors, and this is about twice the starting salary for high school graduates. That is some evidence that a universal **national service program would be inefficient**: it would in effect reallocate a year of a college graduate's working life from after college to before college, when he would be less productive. Against this it could be argued that the national service work that the 18 year olds would perform would have a social value in excess of its private value. But this seems unlikely for most jobs that these teenagers would perform, such as helping out in hospitals and nursing homes and picking up litter on roadsides and in parks. A possible exception is tutoring children, since education produces significant social benefits. But only a small fraction of the 4 million national service conscripts could usefully be employed in that activity. Universal national service would also have peculiar effects on the distribution of income. The unpaid national service workers would replace low-paid service workers, pushing many of them into poverty. Proponents argue that, all narrowly "economic" issues to one side, universal national service would confer intangible social benefits in the form of increased solidarity, as all Americans would share in the experience of working for the overall social good without compensation beyond modest living expenses. But given the heterogeneity of the jobs that the national service workers would be performing, the solidarity-enhancing effect would surely be quite limited. It would be different if the 4 million were all drafted into the armed forces for a year, but that is infeasible. In a candid moment proponents of universal national service might respond that its real purpose is to take rich kids down a peg by forcing them to work for a year with minimal compensation. The hope would be that the experience would make the rich empathize more with the poor and therefore treat them more generously. This seems unlikely, though the issue is worth studying. A person's attitude toward issues of distributive justice is shaped by a variety of factors, including temperament, parental values--and personal experiences not limited to a year's working without pay.

## Internal Link

#### SNAP cuts lead to more hunger and poverty

**Berr** **16’** Berr, Jonathan. “Would Food Stamp Cuts Lead to ‘Hunger and Poverty’?” CBS News, CBS Interactive, 30 Mar. 2016, www.cbsnews.com/news/would-food-stamp-cuts-lead-to-hunger-and-poverty/.

A **budget plan** being considered in the U.S. House of Representatives **would slash spending on** the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program **(SNAP) by** more than **$150 billion over the next decade.** That would have a devastating impact on the nation's poorest and most vulnerable citizens, according to a report from the left-leaning [Center for Budget and Policy Priorities](http://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/house-2017-budget-plan-would-slash-snap-by-more-than-150-billion-over-ten) (CBPP). The plan [approved by the House Budget Committee](http://www.politico.com/story/2016/03/house-budget-committee-approves-budget-220906) this month would cut funding for SNAP, formerly known as food stamps, by more than 20 percent. It includes three major reductions **that would take** food **assistance** benefits away **from about 3 million** low-income people including working families, senior citizens and adults and children with disabilities. Moreover, the spending plan would convert SNAP into a block grant program that would subsequently slash funding by almost 30 percent, or about $125 billion, between 2021 and 2026. SNAP "is primarily targeted at very low-income families, and it's designed to ensure that they have an adequate diet," said Dottie Rosenbaum, one of the CBPP report authors, in an interview. "There's a growing body of literature, especially with very young children, that shows that investment has long-term health benefits and educational benefits." Conservatives have long wanted Congress to rein in SNAP, which is one of the country's largest entitlement programs. Indeed, spending on the program surged from $18 billion in 2001 to $74 billion in 2015. However, as the economy recovered, the number of SNAP recipients has dropped by 2.6 million after peaking in December 2012. "**SNAP cuts** of the magnitude that the House Budget Committee proposes **would almost certainly lead to increases in hunger and poverty**," according to the CBPP. "Under the plan's steep funding cuts, a typical household's SNAP benefits would run out many days earlier (than usual), placing greater strain on household finances (and on emergency food providers) **and significantly increasing the risk of hunger**."

## Impact

#### Extinction- poverty allows for disease, environmental degradation, terrorism and war

Rice 06’ Susan E Rice , and a former assistant secretary of state for African affairs. The National Interest, Spring http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/articles/2006/spring\_globaleconomics\_rice/20060401.pdf

When American s see televised images of bone-thin children with distended bellies, their humanitarian instincts take over. They don’t typically look at unicef footage and perceive a threat that could destroy our way of life. Yet global **poverty** is not solely a humanitarian concern. In real ways, over the long term, it can **threaten** U.S. **nat**ional **security**. Poverty **erodes** weak states’ **capacity to prevent** the spread of **disease and protect the world’s forests** and watersheds**—**some of the global threats Maurice Greenberg noted in the Winter 2005 issue. It also **creates** conditions conducive to transnational **criminal enterprises and terrorist activity**, not only by **making desperate individuals** potentially more susceptible to recruitment, but also, and more significantly, by undermining the state’s ability to prevent and counter those violent threats. Poverty can also give rise to the tensions that erupt in civil conflict, which further taxes the state and allows transnational predators greater freedom of action. Americans can no longer realistically hope that we can erect the proverbial glass dome over our homeland and live safely isolated from the killers—natural or man-made—that plague other parts of the world. Al-Qaeda established training camps in conflict-ridden Sudan and Afghanistan, purchased diamonds from Sierra Leone and Liberia, and now targets American soldiers in Iraq. The potential toll of a global bird-flu pandemic is particularly alarming. A mutated virus causing human-to-human contagion could kill hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of Americans. Today, more than half the world’s population lives on less than $2 per day, and almost 1.1 billion people live in extreme poverty, defined as less than $1 per day. The costs of global poverty are multiple. Poverty **prevents poor countries from devoting** sufficient **resources to** detect and contain deadly **disease**. According to the World Health Organization (who), low- and middle-income countries suffer 90 percent of the world’s disease burden but account for only 11 percent of its health care spending. Poverty also dramatically increases the risk of civil conflict. A recent study by the uk’s Department for International Development showed that a country at $250 gdp per capita has on average a 15 percent risk of internal conflict over five years, while a country at $5,000 per capita has a risk of less than 1 percent. War zones provide ideal operational environs for international outlaws. If in the old days the consequences of extreme poverty could conveniently be confined to the far corners of the planet, this is no longer the case. The end of U.S.-Soviet competition, the civil and regional conflicts that ensued, and the rapid pace of globalization have brought to the fore a new generation of dangers. These are the **complex nexus of transnational security threats**: infectious disease, environmental degradation, international crime and drug syndicates, proliferation of small arms and weapons of mass destruction, and terrorism. Often these threats **emerge from impoverished**, relatively remote regions of the world. They thrive especially in conflict or lawless zones, in countries where corruption is endemic, and in poor, weak states with limited control over their territory or resources.

# Extra

## Uniqueness

#### Trump wants to cut humanitarian aid funding but GOP is holding him back

**Torbati** **17’** Torbati, Yeganeh. “Republicans Push Back against Trump Plan to Cut Foreign Aid.” Reuters, Thomson Reuters, 23 May 2017, www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-budget-foreign-aid/republicans-push-back-against-trump-plan-to-cut-foreign-aid-idUSKBN18J2DC.

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - U.S. President Donald **Trump**’s fellow Republicans in Congress on Tuesday **assailed his proposed cuts in the diplomatic and foreign aid budget**, making it unlikely the **cutbacks in global health, peacekeeping and other programs** will take effect. Senator Lindsey Graham, the **Republican chairman** of the Senate subcommittee responsible for diplomacy and foreign aid spending, **said Trump’s proposal** to cut the diplomacy and aid budget by one third **would “gut soft power.”** “If we implemented this budget, you’d have to retreat from the world or put a lot of people at risk,” Graham told reporters. “This budget is not going to go anywhere.” Congress sets the federal government budget, and **Republicans** who control both houses and Democrats have **said they do not support** such drastic **cuts.** The funding cuts in Trump’s plan for the fiscal year beginning in October would mark a stark decrease in non-military U.S. government engagement abroad as the administration pursues Trump’s “America First” world view. Trump administration officials defend the cuts by saying the rest of the world must do its “fair share” as the United States retreats from its traditional spending abroad. In all, the **Trump proposal** **cuts** about 32 percent from U.S. diplomacy and aid budgets, or **nearly $19 billion.** Trump’s budget would cut U.S. funding for global health programs including efforts focusing on HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria by about one quarter, to about $6.5 billion for 2018. The budget proposal envisions cuts to the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) program, a cornerstone of U.S. global health assistance, which supports HIV/AIDS treatment, testing and counseling for millions of people worldwide. Under Trump’s budget, PEPFAR funding would be $5 billion per year compared to about $6 billion annually now, the State Department said. No patient currently receiving antiretroviral therapy, a treatment for HIV, through PEPFAR funds will lose that treatment, officials said.

## Link

## I-Link

#### Cuts in aid leads to spread of disease

**Kates et al** **17’** Jennifer Katesm Adam Wexler, JoshVice President and Director of Global Health and HIV Policy at the Kaiser Family Foundation, where she oversees the Foundation's policy analysis and research focused on the U.S. government's role in global health and on the global and domestic HIV epidemics~, "What Could U.S. Budget Cuts Mean for Global Health?", Kaiser Foundation, 13 Jun 2017

Based on our models, the **potential health impacts of** these one-year **cuts is significant** across all three budget scenarios. For example, depending on the size of the cut, we estimate that starting next year: Additional **new HIV infections would range from 49,100 to 198,700**; the number of people on antiretrovirals could decline by more than 830,000 in the steepest budget cut scenario; Additional new **TB cases would range from 7,600 to 31,100**; The number of women and couples receiving contraceptives would decline, ranging from 6.2 million to almost 24 million; the increase in the number of abortions would range between 778,000 to almost 3 million; and **Additional maternal, newborn, and child deaths would range between 7,000 and 31,300.** While the fate of this year’s global health budget remains uncertain, **these models illustrate the relationship between** such decisions and health outcomes **in low- and middle-income countries** and provide one important tool for assessing future budget choices.

## Impact

Disease causes extinction

South China Morning Post 96’ (Avi Mensa, 1-4-1996, “Leading the way to a cure for AIDS,” P. Lexis)

Despite the importance of the discovery of the "facilitating" cell, it is not what Dr Ben-Abraham wants to talk about. **There is a much more pressing medical crisis at hand** - one he believes the world must be alerted to: **the possibility of a virus deadlier than HIV**. If this makes Dr Ben-Abraham sound like a prophet of doom, then he makes no apology for it. **AIDS**, **the Ebola outbreak** which killed more than 100 people in Africa last year, **the flu epidemic** that has now affected 200,000 in the former Soviet Union - they **are** all, according to Dr Ben-Abraham, **the "tip of the iceberg"**. Two decades of intensive study and research in the field of virology have convinced him of one thing: in place of natural and man-made disasters or nuclear warfare, **humanity could face extinction** because of a single virus, deadlier than HIV. "**An airborne virus is a** lively, complex and **dangerous organism**," he said. "**It can come from** a rare animal or from **anywhere and** can **mutate constantly**. If there is no cure, it affects one person and then there is a chain reaction and it is unstoppable. **It is a tragedy waiting to happen**."That may sound like a far-fetched plot for a Hollywood film, but Dr Ben -Abraham said history has already proven his theory. Fifteen years ago, few could have predicted the impact of AIDS on the world. Ebola has had sporadic outbreaks over the past 20 years and the only way the deadly virus - which turns internal organs into liquid - could be contained was because it was killed before it had a chance to spread. Imagine, he says, if it was closer to home: an outbreak of that scale in London, New York or Hong Kong. It could happen anytime in the next 20 years - theoretically, it could happen tomorrow.The shock of the AIDS epidemic has prompted virus experts to admit "that something new is indeed happening and that **the threat of a deadly viral outbreak is imminent**", said Joshua Lederberg of the Rockefeller University in New York, at a recent conference. He added that the problem was "very serious and is getting worse". Dr Ben-Abraham said: "Nature isn't benign. The survival of the human species is not a preordained evolutionary programme. Abundant sources of genetic variation exist for viruses to learn how to mutate and evade the immune system." He cites the 1968 Hong Kong flu outbreak as an example of how viruses have outsmarted human intelligence. And as new "mega-cities" are being developed in the Third World and rainforests are destroyed, disease-carrying animals and insects are forced into areas of human habitation. "**This raises the very real possibility that lethal, mysterious viruses would, for the first time, infect humanity at a large scale and imperil the survival of the human race**," he said.

# Frontlines

## Case Blocks